

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 16, 2002 LB 1185

Dierks, this is the way the bill came into the Legislature, the way it was introduced, and I am... I feel like I'm very grateful to the Business and Labor Committee for finding a way to find some middle ground that they could support advancement of the bill. And so at this point in time, I feel like I must support the bill in its current form, even though I certainly understand what you're saying. And it's my hope that with the farms and ranches that have brothers and sons farming or feeding together or ranching together that with exemption for the close relatives that they will be able to, for the most part, exist or at least have a good shot at not being subject to this requirement. Although those large operations that hire a number of employees who are not related certainly are going to have to comply. And I don't really have that much of a problem with it because I think there you are getting into a different kind of operation, for the most part, so... and one that should build this cost into their structure. So I understand the proposal. I would like to support it. I feel like I'm unable to because I think the committee has done a lot of work on this and I need to support the committee on this particular issue. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Beutler, you're recognized.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bromm, could I just ask you a couple of questions, if I may. Obviously from what I've said before, you would guess that I am of the opinion that this amendment is certainly not acceptable. But as I started to look at laws in other states, I looked at Iowa's first because that seemed to me to be right next to us, a farm state. Everything, the factors should be relatively the same. and they have a broad definition of related employees, exempting related employees, not unsimilar to what you've done in this bill. But they don't have a number of employees kind of criteria. You've adopted that from someplace else, apparently, and in Iowa they say that if the person is... if the employer has a total cash payroll to one or more persons other than related parties that amounted to \$2,500 or more during the preceding calendar year. Do you understand Iowa's law with related to... with regard to nonrelated parties as virtually including anybody or everybody? If you have one employee, you probably are under the law, is that the way you